

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-20 are pending for examination.

Claims 1-20 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "Write Short Messages in the Subject Only," Heinz Tschabitscher.

3. As per claim 1, Tschabitscher teaches an electronic message notification display (In describing email communication, it is inherent that there is a display associated with the format Tschabitscher describes. It is well-known in the art that email communication can only take place with a display for email parts), comprising:

a representation of information corresponding to a subject field of an electronic message (Tschabitscher describes emails containing a message only in the subject line); and

an indicia associated with the electronic message that notifies a recipient of the electronic message that information contained in the subject field comprises a complete message for the recipient (where EOM (End of Message), SIM (Subject is Message), or other phrase in the subject line may indicate that the message is contained in only the subject line of the email).

4. As per claim 2, Tschabitscher teaches the display of claim 1, wherein the indicia is provided on the display based on a notice field of the electronic message (where EOM (End of Message), SIM (Subject is Message), or other phrase in the subject line may indicate that the message is contained in only the subject line of the email).
5. As per claim 3, Tschabitscher teaches the display of claim 2, wherein the notice field further comprises at least one bit having a value, based on which the indicia is provided (It is well known in the art that the data represented in the subject line is represented by a series of bits. With this, it is inherent that the EOM message in the subject line of an email would be represented by a series of bits).
6. As per claim 5, Tschabitscher teaches the display of claim 1, wherein the indicia is located proximal to the representation of information contained in the subject field (where the EOM message is contained within the subject field).
7. As per claim 6, Tschabitscher teaches the display of claim 5, wherein the indicia further comprises at least one text and graphics (where the EOM message is text at the end of the subject line of an email).
8. As per claim 7, Tschabitscher teaches the display of claim 1, wherein the electronic message corresponds to an unopened electronic message, whereby the recipient can access the complete message without opening the electronic message (where the use of the EOM message in the subject line conveys to the recipient that they need not open the message).
9. As per claim 8, Tschabitscher teaches an electronic mail (email) system, comprising:

a user interface that provides a human-machine interface associated with an email application program (In describing email communication, it is inherent that there is a display associated with the format Tschabitscher describes. It is well-known in the art that email communication can only take place with a display for email parts); and

a notice component associated with the email application program, the notice component being operative to set a notice field of an email message based on an input instruction provided by the user interface, the notice field having a value that indicates if a freely parsable field of the email message contains a complete message for at least one intended recipient (where EOM (End of Message), SIM (Subject is Message), or other phrase in the subject line may indicate that the message is contained in only the subject line of the email).

10. As per claim 9, Tschabitscher teaches the system of claim 8, wherein the email program provides an indicia associated with a representation of the email message based on the value of the notice field (where EOM (End of Message), SIM (Subject is Message), or other phrase in the subject line may indicate that the message is contained in only the subject line of the email).

11. As per claim 10, Tschabitscher teaches the system of claim 9, wherein the indicia is located proximal to a representation of the parsable field in the representation of the email message (where the EOM message is contained within the subject field).

12. As per claim 11, Tschabitscher teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the parsable field comprises a subject field of the email message (where the EOM message is contained within the subject field).

13. As per claim 12, Tschabitscher teaches the system of claim 8, wherein the notice field further comprises at least one bit (It is well known in the art that the data represented in the subject line is represented by a series of bits. With this, it is inherent that the EOM message in the subject line of an email would be represented by a series of bits).

14. As per claim 14, Tschabitscher teaches the system of claim 8, wherein the email program operative to initiate transfer of the email message from a sender to at least one recipient based on at least one corresponding recipient address (It is well known in the art that any email program is operative to send an email from a sending email address to a single or group of receiving email addresses).

15. As per claim 15, Tschabitscher teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method comprising:

displaying an indicia associated with an email message to notify at least one recipient of the email message that the subject field of the email message contains a complete message intended for at least one intended recipient (where EOM (End of Message), SIM (Subject is Message), or other phrase in the subject line may indicate that the message is contained in only the subject line of the email).

16. As per claim 16, Tschabitscher teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 15, wherein the method further comprises parsing an incoming email message to extract information encoded by a notice field, the displaying of the indicia being performed based on the notice field (where the EOM message is displayed in the subject line, which displays in the mailbox).

17. As per claim 17, Tschabitscher teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 15, wherein, prior to the displaying of the indicia, the method further comprises setting a notice field of the email message by a notice function of a sender's email application to a value that indicates whether the subject field of the email message contains the complete message for the at least one intended recipient (where the sender includes the EOM message in the subject line of an email sent to a recipient, which serves to notify the receiver that the message is contained in the subject line).

18. As per claim 19, Tschabitscher teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 15, wherein the method further comprises displaying the indicia proximal to a representation of the subject field in a graphical representation of the email message (where the EOM message is contained within the subject field).

19. As per claim 20, Tschabitscher teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 15, wherein the graphical representation of the email message corresponds to an unopened email message (where the subject line and sender are shown in email client mailboxes without having to open the email).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 4121

21. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

22. Claims 4, 13, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Write Short Messages in the Subject Only," Heinz Tschabitscher, as applied to claims 3, 8, and 17 above, and further in view of US 2003/0208544, Wilson.

23. As per claim 4, Tschabitscher teaches the display of claim 3.

Tschabitscher does not expressly teach a method to include an urgent flag with an email. Wilson teaches a multifunction email server wherein:

the notice field further comprises a plurality of bits, at least a portion thereof designating a level of urgency associated with the electronic message (paragraph [0056], where there is an urgent input field in addition to other input fields).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include an urgent field in any email system. As is common in the art, flags associated with emails have been used to set them off from other messages. An urgent field as shown by Wilson would provide the benefit of showing the recipient of the urgency of the message. This would be beneficial in any method, especially that taught by Tschabitscher. Including an urgent flag would further simplify the email process, as

recipients could further simplify their email reading by being able to determine both the message and the urgency without opening the message.

24. As per claim 13, Tschabitscher teaches the system of claim 8.

Tschabitscher does not expressly teach a method to include an urgent flag with an email. Wilson teaches a multifunction email server wherein:

the notice field further comprises a plurality of bits, at least a portion of the plurality of bits designating a level of urgency associated with the electronic message (paragraph [0056], where there is an urgent input field in addition to other input fields). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include an urgent field in any email system. As is common in the art, flags associated with emails have been used to set them off from other messages. An urgent field as shown by Wilson would provide the benefit of showing the recipient of the urgency of the message. This would be beneficial in any method, especially that taught by Tschabitscher. Including an urgent flag would further simplify the email process, as recipients could further simplify their email reading by being able to determine both the message and the urgency without opening the message.

25. As per claim 18, Tschabitscher teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 17.

Tschabitscher does not expressly teach a method to include an urgent flag with an email. Wilson teaches a multifunction email server wherein:

the setting of the notice field further comprises setting a plurality of bits to a value that designates a level of urgency associated with the email message (paragraph [0056], where there is an urgent input field in addition to other input fields).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include an urgent field in any email system. As is common in the art, flags associated with emails have been used to set them off from other messages. An urgent field as shown by Wilson would provide the benefit of showing the recipient of the urgency of the message. This would be beneficial in any method, especially that taught by Tschabitscher. Including an urgent flag would further simplify the email process, as recipients could further simplify their email reading by being able to determine both the message and the urgency without opening the message.

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 7 222 156, Gupta et al teaches integrating collaborative messaging into an electronic mail program.

US 2004/0039786, Horvitz et al teaches the use of a bulk email system within an urgent email system.

US 6 212 553, Lee et al teaches a method for sending and receiving flags and associated data in emails.

US 2003/0023688, Denenberg et al teaches a method of message sorting and retrieval.

US 6 708 202, Shuman et al teaches a method for highlighting information in an email.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THOMAS RICHARDSON whose telephone number is (571)270-1191. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Taghi Arani can be reached on (571) 272-3787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TR

/Taghi T. Arani/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4121
1/14/2007